

JAN 06 2006

09/812,207

MS158541.01/MSFTP192US

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

**I. Rejection of Claims 1-22 Under 35 U.S.C §112**

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. The specification contains a written description of the invention in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to carry out the invention. However, the Examiner contends at page 2 of the Final Office Action (dated November 2, 2005), that no support exists in the original disclosure for the limitation "reports at least one of simulated run time and compile time information based upon design time attributes". Contrary to the Examiner's contentions, support for these features is thoroughly disclosed in the specification portion of applicants' invention. For example:

*At design time*, a developer requests the development tool 510 to *report information* (e.g., attributes such as properties and events) concerning an instance of a component 550...The information (e.g., attributes such as properties and events) can be *pure metadata* 540 or *information manipulated* through a custom type descriptor interface 560 on the instance of the component 550. The type descriptor 520 then provides the information to the type descriptor filter service 580 that can *manipulate the information by*: (1) adding additional attributes (e.g., properties and events); (2) removing attributes (e.g., properties and events); and/or (3) replacing attributes (e.g., properties and events) with different values *in order to simulate the run time environment*. (See page 10, line 17 – page 11, line 3)

It is readily apparent the development tool can report at least one of compile time information (e.g., pure metadata compiled into the component at compile time; *see e.g.*, page 4, ll. 8-9) and simulated run time information (e.g., information manipulated in order to simulate the run time environment) based upon design time attributes (*see e.g.*, page 3, ll. 24-25).

09/812,207

MS158541.01/MSFTP192US

Accordingly, this rejection of claims 1-22 should be withdrawn.

## II. Rejection of Claims 1-22 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sarkar (US 6,012,067). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. Sarkar does not teach or suggest each and every feature recited in the subject claims.

“A claim is anticipated only if *each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Emphasis added. “*The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim.*” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

### ***Independent claims 1, 8, and 14***

Applicants' claimed invention relates to an application development system that can discover the design time attributes of a component and simulate how a component behaves at run time without the need to reconstruct the component. In particular, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 8 and 14) recites, “a development tool that facilitates *application development in a design time environment* and *reports at least one of simulated run time and compile time information based upon design time attributes* and a *type descriptor* that ... provides information associated with an instance of the software component to *the development tool.*” Sarkar does not disclose or suggest these novel features.

Rather, Sarkar relates to a multi-tier client/server architecture, wherein the first tier is a web browser on the client side (*see* Fig. 1; col. 6, ll. 55-56), with business logic (second tier) and a relational database (third tier) on the server side (*see* Fig. 1; col. 7, ll. 1-3). Sarkar puts the business logic inside the relational database, thereby eliminating the middle tier. (*See* col. 7, ll. 5-9; col. 10, ll. 30-45). Sarkar employs the native abilities of URLs that can access web objects, as well as the native abilities of relational database server links for remote distributed databases and object pointers to reference any kind of object within the relational database (which now includes business logic). (*See* col. 5, ll. 19-35). Thus, a mechanism is employed to manipulate objects in relational databases over the internet. (*See* col. 5, ll. 11-14). This mechanism is an

09/812,207

MS158541.01/MSFTP192US

SQL query or an ORB request carrying the SQL query. (See Abstract; col. 5, ll. 58-65; col. 7, ll. 3-5; col. 10, ll. 35-38). The types of objects Sarkar can manipulate include web objects and business objects. Web objects include text, images, audio, video, and HTML pages. (See col. 5, line 17; col. 5, ll. 21-22; col. 2, ll. 34-35; col. 10, ll. 54-55). Business object include results of queries across distributed relational database with business application logic applied to those results, CORBA objects and other objects within a relational database such as tables. (See col. 5, ll. 14-17; col. 2, ll. 32-33; col. 5, ll. 25-26).

Accordingly, Sarkar provides a mechanism (*i.e.*, SQL query) for manipulating objects (*i.e.* web objects or relational data) in relational databases over the internet, but does not teach or suggest “a development tool that facilitates *application development in a design time environment* and *reports at least one of simulated run time and compile time information based upon design time attributes*”. Contrary to the Examiner’s contentions at page 3 of the Final Office Action (dated November 2, 2005), an SQL query is not “*a development tool* that facilitates application development in a design time environment...” As well, objects (*i.e.*, web objects and data in a relational database) are not *applications*, but rather, *objects*. Accordingly, manipulating an object as described in Sarkar does not teach or suggest “a development tool that facilitates *application development* in a design time environment...” Sarkar discloses that applets can be downloaded (*see* col. 5, ll. 54-57), and applications written for a specific business can be employed (*see* col. 9, ll. 39-46), but the reference does not facilitate application *development*. In fact, Sarkar does not distinguish between an *application* and a *server* (*see* col. 5, line 67 – col. 6, line 1; col. 10, ll. 33-35), and the reference is silent regarding server and tier development as well.

In essence, the Examiner’s rationale argues that a web browser networked to relational databases that include business logic is a design time environment, and the manipulation of objects *via* SQL queries is application development. Such an argument is not within the scope of the reference. Furthermore, Sarkar does not teach or suggest “a development tool that...reports at least one of *simulated run time* and *compile time* information based upon design time attributes.” Rather, Sarkar employs SQL queries to join tables and apply business/process logic to these join operations (*see* Figs. 3-11; col. 9, ll. 43-46; col. 9, ll. 59-62; col. 10, ll. 16-17), but in every case the operations occur at a run time state (*i.e.*, while the join operation operates on

09/812,207

MS158541.01/MSFTP192US

the tables). Sarkar does not contemplate reporting at least one of simulated run time and compile time information based upon design time attributes.

Moreover, at page 3, the Examiner argues that the SQL queries are the development tool (e.g., the “mechanism”) and at page 4 the Examiner argues that the SQL queries are the type descriptor, whereas the subject claims recite “*a type descriptor* that ... provides information ... *to the development tool.*” Sarkar does not teach or suggest that an SQL query provides information to the SQL query. Accordingly, Sarkar does not teach the identical invention in as complete detail as the subject claims, and this rejection of independent claims 1, 8, 14 as well as all claims that depend there from, should be withdrawn.

***Independent claims 16, 18, and 21***

The subject invention further relates to a component based environment wherein static metadata can be compiled in a component and can then be dynamically adjusted to reflect modifications in design time. In accordance therewith, run time behavior of a component can be simulated based upon design time manipulations without recompiling the component. In particular, independent claim 16 (and similarly independent claims 18 and 21) recites, “*manipulating compile time information regarding the instance of the component...for simulating component behavior at one of a design time and a runtime*”. Sarkar does not disclose or suggest these novel features.

At page 8, the Final Office Action contends Sarkar discloses the aforementioned features at col. 5, ll. 11-14. However, the indicated portions simply recite, “*It is a primary objective of the present invention to provide a mechanism for representing and manipulating heterogeneous objects in relational databases over the internet.*” The Examiner incorrectly construes a mechanism for representing objects in a relational database as equivalent to *simulating component behavior at one of a design time and a runtime*. Sarkar “represents” objects by encapsulating SQL queries in well-known Java constructs. (See col. 9, ll. 9-11; col. 5, ll. 37-39). Sarkar is void of any teaching or suggestion of manipulating *compile time information regarding the instance of the component...for simulating component behavior at one of a design time and a runtime*. Accordingly, the withdrawal of this rejection of independent claims 16, 18, and 21, as well as all associated dependent claims, is requested.

09/812,207

MS158541.01/MSFTP192US

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP192US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731